

REMARKS – General

By the above amendment, the applicant has amended the claims 6 to overcome the technical objections as pointed out by last OA.

5

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112 has been overcome

The applicant has amended the Claim 6 to overcome Claim rejection Under 35 USC § 112 as pointed out by last OA.

10

Objection to Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

The last O.A. rejected the Claims 6-7 "as being anticipated by Gollnick [US 5,844,893]" Applicant requests withdraw of these rejections for the following reasons:

15

Gollnick only provides a controller (40 of fig.3) of a whole network system (fig.3 as whole) connecting with network (fig.3, 50) which has multiple base RF transceivers (fig.3 52A-C, col.4 Ins 45-49). This is completely different from the RWNL device of the applicant's current invention, which is a complete working

20

device with multiple wireless and wired networking units in one enclosure (fig.1) Because this fundamental difference, every elements and means in detail are different or not referenced at all between Gollnick and the applicant's current invention.

25

Regarding claim 6,

Gollnick's disclosure is "a preferred implementation relates to improvements in radio data communication systems wherein a number of mobile transceiver units are to transmit data to a number of base stations under a wide range of operating conditions (col.1 Ins 16-19)" which "provides an improved network controller to

serve as a consolidation link between one or more host computers and one or more base transceiver units, each of which may be communicative with many mobile portable transceiver units being moved about a warehouse complex for the collection of data. (col.1 Ins 48-53)". Specifically, Gollnick's network controller 5 (fig.2 item 40, fig.3 item 40, or figs. 9-12 items 40A, 40B) is working as one element of a communication (fig.3) as "network controller 40 is coupled to host computer 42 such that data may be interchanged between the devices over host communications link 44, which may be either in an RS232C format or selectively in an RS422 format. The host communication link 44 couples to controller 40 at 10 host port 46." (col.4 Ins 38-43); "First communication port 48 of controller 40 provides means for coupling of network 50 to controller 40. Network 50 comprises a number of base RF transceiver units 52A, 52B and 53B, each of which may be selectively employed in the radio frequency communication of data from mobile transceiver units" (col.4 In 44-49); "second communication port 57 is 15 coupled over third link 53 to previously installed base transceiver 54" (col.5 Ins 16-18); and "Diagnostic port 55 provides a fourth communication pathway for network controller 40, providing an asynchronous port operable at 300 to 19,200 baud as an RS232C interface" (col.5 Ins 31-34).

The applicant's current invention discloses one "multi-channel redundant wireless link (RWNL) device" to communicate to one other RWNL device wirelessly form a multi-channel redundant wireless link for the two wired network (wired attached correspondently to each RWNL device) to communicate.

The communication field, system and device are different between Gollnick's disclosure and the applicant's current invention. Further in detail:

25 Gollnick's network controllers (40A, 40B in fig.9-11) connect to same host network wiredly (V-35 64K Mainframe in fig.9, Ethernet 1000 in fig.10, token ring 1100A,B in fig.11). When not connected to same host network, Gollnick's network controllers (40A,40B in fig.12) are connected to same wired network

channel 56 wiredly. In the applicant's current invention, it is to provide redundant communication between two RWNL devices with multi-channel wireless link.

The last OA points out that Gollnick's network controller (40A, 40B in fig.9-12) also comprising:

- 5 A processor (fig.4, col.6 ln 4-13); a system function means; (see fig.4 and col.6, ln 4-13 and ln 36-41); and so on. The last OA also point out that Gollnick's network controller (40A,40B in fig.9-12) comprises "a plurality of wireless networking units see figs.9-12, col.7 lines 39-46." However, specifically, Gollnick's network controller may use "I/O bus 700 may be coupled with a spread spectrum transmission (SST) or ultra high frequency (UHF) transceiver 701 which may correspond with any of the transceivers of units 52A, 52B, 52C or 54 previously referred to (see figs.9-12, col.7 lines 39-46)," which means Gollnick's network controller (fig.7) may couple only one "base radio transceiver SST or UHF 701" using BUS-I/O 700 and port 3 (fig.7 7-73) to correspond with other stand alone transceivers such as 52A, 52B, 52C or 54. In conclusion, Gollnick's network controller may include ONE radio transceiver the most with **special coupling** to communication port and system bus. This is completely different from the applicant's current invention, where multiple system elements are designed to attaches to system buses (fig.1, 107,108). Therefore, even without considering the system application difference, the unit system architecture is different between Gollnick's network controller and the RWNL device of the applicant's current invention. Accordingly, the system function means are different.

- The last OA also point out that "where in said wireless networking unit can 25 communicate with remote wireless networking device forming a wireless networking sub-link via antenna means, see figs 9-12, col.8, lines 22-24." To the best understanding of the applicant, Gollnick discloses a communication system with several of stand alone radio router (fig.9, 901, 902, 903), which are made of unit designed with concept of 700 fig.7, communicating with same channel 56.

10

Therefore, there is no "wireless sub-link" presence in this scenario, because all the "radio routers (fig.9, 901, 902, 903)" are stand alone unit. The wireless sub-link in the applicant's current invention is formed by wireless networking units inside the RWNL device and communicating correspondently with the wireless networking units of a remote RWNL device.

Therefore, the applicant suggests the last OA rejects the claim 6 of the applicant's current application over Gollnick is improper. The applicant respectfully requests withdraw of this rejection.

10

Regarding claim 7, the last OA points out that "Gollnick further discloses a method wherein the said RWNL device include a control unit for extending the system control to wireless networking unites whereby said control unit connect to system bus whereby said control unit connects to said wireless networking units whereby said processor unit can extend the controlling capability via the control unit. See figs 7-13, col.4 lines 36-67, col.7 lines." To the best understanding, Gollnick discloses (col.4 lines 36-67) a network controller 40 to coupling of network 50, which "comprises a number of base RF transceiver units 52A, 52B and 53B, each of which may be selectively employed in the radio frequency communication of data from mobile transceiver units (col.4 In 46-49)." Referring to fig.3, fig.9-12, network controller 40 and base RF transceiver units 52A, 52B and 53B are complete standalone devices forming a wireless communication network. The control unit of the applicant's current invention is a functional element within the RWNL device. (Fig.1, 109) Gollnick does not disclose a control unit or the method of using the control unit to extend the control from processor to wireless networking units like the applicant's current invention.

11

Therefore, the applicant suggests the last OA's rejection of the claim 7 of the applicant's current application over Gollnick is improper. The applicant respectfully requests withdraw of this rejection.

5 Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, the applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore he submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action he respectfully solicits.

Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

Applicant has amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition of allowance, Applicant respectfully request the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this applicant in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very respectfully,



Franklin Zhigang Zhang

25

4717 Spencer street,
Torrance, CA 90503
Tel: (310)901-2631
Email: endeavour@franklins.com

30

Date: 2006 JULY 12